

REMARKS

Applicants note the Examiner has raised objections to the drawings. Applicants transmit currently herewith replacement sheets consisting of formal drawings for the Examiner's review and approval.

By the entry of this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claims 4, 6 and 7 which have been canceled. The remaining claims have been amended to depend either directly or indirectly on claim 1.

Claims 1-3 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the single Zucker et al. patent. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Zucker et al. in view of Beeston et al. Claims 8-15 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zucker et al as modified by Beeston et al. and what the Examiner incorrectly characterizes as "applicant's admitted prior art of record". Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 now requires that at least one corresponding photoconductor comprises a photoconductive diode including a modified electrode structure that includes a plurality of strips formed on a surface of the photoconductive diode. The Examiner contends that "Applicant admitted that a conventional diode can be modified to achieve operational performance required of the system architecture". The Examiner is incorrectly characterizing applicant's specification. In fact, applicant's specification TEACHES that a conventional diode can be modified. There is no admission in the specification that the modification of a conventional diode is known in the prior art.

Referring to page 8, line 17 of the specification, the applicant states "It has been found..." in terms of applicant's own discovery, namely, APPLICANT HAS FOUND that a conventional diode can be modified. Applicant notes that the discussion of the electrode structure was not placed in the Background of Invention section of the specification where prior art would be properly discussed. Further, Fig. 6 - -which illustrates the electrode structure- - was not identified as illustrating prior art as is the apparent contention of the Examiner. Instead, the modified electrode structure was considered part of applicant's invention as evidenced by the original claims.

Neither Zucker et al. nor Beeston et al. discloses or suggests the modified electrode structure set forth in claim 1 or the specifics of the modified electrode structure set forth in the dependent claims. Accordingly, neither reference provides any suggestion for modifying the admitted conventional diode in the manner taught and claimed in the application at issue. The

Examiner cannot rely on the incorrect and improper characterization of applicants own discovery of the modified electrode structure as "admitted prior art". Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-3, 5, 8-15, 18 and 9 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

20 FEBRUARY 2007

DATE

/Marc A. Rossi/

MARC A. ROSSI
REG. NO. 31,923

P.O. Box 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)